

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/730,276	12/09/2003	Alain Tornier	14542	2602	
293 75	10/18/2005		EXAMINER		
Ralph A. Dow	ell of DOWELL & DOV	MCKANE, ELIZABETH L			
2111 Eisenhow	er Ave.				
Suite 406			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Alexandria, V	A 22314		1744		
			DATE MAILED: 10/18/200	DATE MAILED: 10/18/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				IV-		
		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/730,276	TORNIER, ALAIN			
		Examiner	Art Unit	<u></u>		
		Leigh McKane	1744			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address	ş		
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA asions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICA' 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply fill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS cause the application to become ABANI	TION.  be timely filed  from the mailing date of this community  DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133)	·		
Status						
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
·	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under E					
Dispositi	on of Claims					
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5)	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is/are rejected.						
7)	7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.				
Applicati	on Papers					
9)[	The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.				
	The drawing(s) filed on <u>09 December 2003</u> is/ar		jected to by the Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance.	See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction	, ,,,	•			
11) 🔲	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached O	ffice Action or form PTO-15	<b>i2</b> .		
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
_	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign ☑ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 11	9(a)-(d) or (f).			
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.		•		
•	2. Certified copies of the priority documents	• •	<del></del>			
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior		eived in this National Stage	e		
	application from the International Bureau	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
- 8	ee the attached detailed Office action for a list of	of the certified copies not rec	eived.	,		
	•					
Attachment		_				
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Sumi Paper No(s)/M	mary (PTO-413) ail Date			
3) 🔀 Infom	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  No(s)/Mail Date 120903.		nal Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Application/Control Number: 10/730,276 Page 2

Art Unit: 1744

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nicolais (EP 982236) in view of Hamilton et al (EP 737481) in view of Ahlqvist et al (US 5881534).

With respect to claims 1-3 and 8-10, Nicolais teaches a process for the sterile packaging of a prosthetic implant 10 wherein the implant is placed in a flexible, gas-impermeable sachet 18 under vacuum and the sachet 18 is heat sealed. The sachet containing the implant is then placed within a flexible gas-impermeable envelope 20 which is also heat sealed. This sealed envelope 20 containing the sachet and implant is folded upon itself and placed within a rigid outer container 28 to protect the implant. See Figure 2; paragraphs [0012]-[0027]. Nicolais is silent with respect to the implant (hip joint prosthesis) being made of polyethylene or to forming an inert gaseous atmosphere within the envelope before sealing.

Hamilton et al discloses that it was known in the art at the time of the invention to fabricate artificial joints from polymeric materials, such as ultrahigh molecular weight polyethylene and to sterilize these joints using radiation. See Abstract; page 1, lines 7-10. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ the sterile packaging method of Nicolais to package and sterilize implants fabricated from polyethylene since they are

safely sterilized by radiation and since polyethylene is a common material from which artificial joints are fabricated.

Ahlqvist et al teaches that when either an article or the packaging in which the article is enclosed is fabricated from a polymer, such as polyethylene, it is necessary to remove oxygen from the atmosphere surrounding the polyethylene so that during radiation the formation of free radicals is minimized. To remove the oxygen, Ahlqvist et al discloses that the article or container be surrounded by an inert gas (nitrogen). See col.5, line 60 to col.6, line 52.

Since Nicolais alone teaches forming the envelope 20 of a polymeric material, such as polyethylene, it would have been obvious to form an inert gas atmosphere within the envelope 20 of Nicolais before sealing, thus minimizing free radical damage to the envelope.

As to claim 4, Nicolais teaches that the sachet 18 may be formed of laminates of different materials (paragraphs [0020]-[0021]) but does not teach a laminate containing aluminum for the sachet 18. Ahlqvist et al discloses a gas-impermeable container suitable for radiation sterilization that preferably contains an aluminum layer. See col.6, lines 41-47. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to choose a gas-impermeable packaging material known in the art to be sealable, stable over long periods of storage, and capable of withstanding irradiation. As the packaging material of Ahlqvist et al meets these requirements and as Nicolais is not limited to a particular packaging material, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to choose the aluminum laminate packaging material of Ahlqvist et al for the sachet 18 of Nicolais.

With respect to claim 5, Nicolais teaches that the envelope 20 can be fabricated from "flexible polymeric films" that are gas impermeable. Suggested materials include polyethylene Art Unit: 1744

and nylon (polyamide). See paragraph [0023]. However, Nicolais does not disclose a film containing both nylon and polyethylene. Hamilton et al teaches sealed, gas-impermeable packaging material that is irradiated for sterilization of the articles within. Suggested materials includes a multilayered film containing both nylon and polyethylene. See page 3, lines 6-14. As this packaging material fulfills the requirements of Nicolais (gas-impermeable, sealable, and radiation sterilizable), one would have found it obvious to use the packaging material of Hamilton et al. for the envelope 20 of Nicolais.

As to claims 6 and 7, the combination of Nicolais with Ahlqvist et al teaches removing oxygen from the envelope 20 (presumably by vacuum) and filling the envelope with an inert gas. Ahlqvist et al does not disclose a pressure to which one should fill the inert gas. However, as Nicolais teaches keeping the sachet 18 under a vacuum, it would have been obvious to also maintain the inert gas-filled envelope 20 below atmospheric. Moreover, in order to control the introduction of inert gas into the envelope it is deemed obvious to employ suitable control means, such as calibration, for accuracy.

## Conclusion

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leigh McKane whose telephone number is 571-272-1275. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (5:30 am-2:00 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Kim can be reached on 571-272-1142. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/730,276

Art Unit: 1744

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

**Primary Examiner** 

Page 5

Art Unit 1744

elm

16 October 2005